Inter-universal entanglement in a cyclic multiverse

Salvador Robles-Pérez,[1,2] Adam Balcerzak,[3,4] Mariusz P. Dąbrowski,[3,5,4] and Manuel Krämer[3]

[1] *Instituto de Física Fundamental, CSIC, Serrano 121, 28006 Madrid, Spain*
[2] *Estación Ecológica de Biocosmología, Pedro de Alvarado, 14, 06411 Medellín, Spain.*
[3] *Institute of Physics, University of Szczecin, Wielkopolska 15, 70-451 Szczecin, Poland*
[4] *Copernicus Center for Interdisciplinary Studies, Sławkowska 17, 31-016 Kraków, Poland*
[5] *National Centre for Nuclear Research, Andrzeja Sołtana 7, 05-400 Otwock, Poland*

(Dated: January 18, 2017)

We study scenarios of parallel cyclic multiverses which allow for a different evolution of the physical constants, while having the same geometry. These universes are classically disconnected, but quantum-mechanically entangled. Applying the thermodynamics of entanglement, we calculate the temperature and the entropy of entanglement. It emerges that the entropy of entanglement is large at big bang and big crunch singularities of the parallel universes as well as at the maxima of the expansion of these universes. The latter seems to confirm earlier studies that quantum effects are strong at turning points of the evolution of the universe performed in the context of the timeless nature of the Wheeler-DeWitt equation and decoherence. On the other hand, the entropy of entanglement at big rip singularities is going to zero despite its presumably quantum nature. This may be an effect of total dissociation of the universe structures into infinitely separated patches violating the null energy condition. However, the temperature of entanglement is large/infinite at every classically singular point and at maximum expansion and seems to be a better measure of quantumness.

PACS numbers: 98.80.Qc, 03.65.Yz

arXiv:1701.04773v1 [gr-qc] 17 Jan 2017

I. INTRODUCTION

The idea of parallel universes due to Everett [1] and its more exotic extensions [2, 3] has been put into a more mathematical shape within the framework of the superstring landscape [4] (though not without doubts [5]) and now is taken more and more seriously as a hypothesis testable by observations.

One of the key points of a possible verifiability of such an idea is the fact that some classically disconnected regions of spacetime or universes can be quantum-mechanically entangled and this entanglement can have some influence on observational quantities in our universe or in each universe of the whole set known as the multiverse. In Ref. [6], for example, it was suggested that the dark flow of matter in our universe – as represented by an extra cosmic microwave background (CMB) temperature dipole – could be due to the quantum-mechanical interference of our universe with the other universes of the multiverse. More effects, such as the suppression of the power spectrum at large angular scales, running of the spectral index, and a suppression of the σ_8 parameter have been suggested to result from having an extra contribution to an average Friedmann equation describing our universe due to quantum entanglement [7].

The idea of quantum entanglement is a well-established area of physics and enters into such disciplines like quantum information, quantum cryptography, quantum-dense coding, computational algorithms, quantum teleportation and many others [8–10]. It has also been considered in the context of cosmology and astrophysics in numerous papers [11–14]. Very interesting features of the entanglement of particle physics processes have been found [15], including the entanglement of four photons [16].

The most natural framework for investigations of entanglement is quantum cosmology [17]. However, while one of the main formulations of canonical quantum gravity is based on the Wheeler-DeWitt equation, the best formulation which can be used for calculations with regard to the quantum entanglement problem is the third quantization picture in which creation and annihilation operators for universes are postulated [18–20]. This formulation was used to discuss the problem of entanglement in a quantum-cosmological picture [21–23].

Besides, in the third quantization picture, one is able to describe the quantum-mechanical scheme for the birth of baby universes [18]. An interesting problem is how one gets new universes as separate entities ("the separate universe problem") within the framework of the classical and quantum picture [24–30].

In this paper, we will be interested in extending the discussion of Ref. [31] of classical cyclic universes or multiverses originally based on the idea of Tolman [32, 33] and on the idea of varying constants [34] onto the quantum-mechanical picture of entanglement, and relate it to the problem of decoherence and the arrow of time in cosmology [35–37]. As a starting point, the quantum-cosmological picture will be applied [38–40]. A previous point related to that was that some strong quantum effects are possible at the turning point of the evolution of the universe [35, 41, 42] – later the scenario was dubbed as a simple harmonic universe (SHU) in Refs. [43, 44].

The paper is organized as follows: In section II we present the classical picture of cyclic universes evolving parallelly in the multiverse. In section III we describe the formalism of quantum entanglement in the context of the

multiverse and in section IV we calculate the temperature and entropy of entanglement for the cosmological models under study. In section V we give our conclusions.

II. CLASSICAL CYCLIC MULTIVERSES

In Ref. [31] the classical behaviour of cyclic models of the universe (with finite values of the mass density and pressure at the turning points) due to the dynamics of the gravitational constant with pulses starting from a big bang and terminating at a big crunch which then again becomes a big bang has been analysed. These models assumed a special type of the scale factor, which we will refer to as "sinusoidal pulse" in the following (see Fig. 1), given by

$$a(t) = a_0 \left| \sin\left(\pi \frac{t}{t_c}\right) \right|, \tag{1}$$

where a_0, t_c = const., and a varying gravitational constant given by

$$G(t) = \frac{G_0}{a^2(t)}. \tag{2}$$

Assuming a closed universe with a constant velocity of light c, the energy density is equal to

$$\rho(t) = \frac{3}{8\pi G_0}\left[\frac{\pi^2}{t_c^2}\left(a_0^2 - a^2\right) + c^2\right] > 0, \tag{3}$$

where $a \in (0, a_0)$. The Friedmann equation reads as

$$H^2 \equiv \frac{1}{a^2}\left(\frac{da}{dt}\right)^2 = \frac{\pi^2}{t_c^2}\left(\frac{a_0^2}{a^2} - 1\right). \tag{4}$$

Even though we have taken a positive curvature, $k = +1$, in (4), this equation can be considered as equivalent to the evolution equation of an open anti-de Sitter universe, for which the Friedmann equation reads as

$$H^2 = -\Lambda + \frac{1}{a^2}, \tag{5}$$

provided that we choose

$$\Lambda \equiv \frac{\pi^2}{t_c^2} \;\text{ and }\; a_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Lambda}}. \tag{6}$$

Besides, the relation (2) gives a timeless trajectory in configuration space

$$G(a) = \frac{G_0}{a^2} \tag{7}$$

for the two variables (a, G) [35].

Following Ref. [31] one is able to extend this cyclic model into at least two universes of the same geometry, but with a different evolution of the gravitational constants in each of them.



FIG. 1: Scale factor for the cyclic multiverse (sinusoidal pulse).

Another example of a cyclic universe of Ref. [31] (with finite values of the mass density and pressure at the turning points) with pulses starting at a big bang and terminating at a big rip (see, Fig. 2), which then connects to a big bang, is possible when one chooses the scale factor to be

$$a(t) = a_0 \left| \tan\left(\pi \frac{t}{t_s}\right) \right|, \tag{8}$$

where a_0, t_s = const., and the gravitational constant to vary as

$$G\,(t) = \frac{4G_s}{\sin^2\left(2\pi \frac{t}{t_s}\right)}. \tag{9}$$

The timeless trajectory in configuration space for (8) and (9) is given by

$$G(a) = \frac{G_s}{a_0^2}\,\frac{(a^2 + a_0^2)^2}{a^2}, \tag{10}$$

which shows that at both the big bang ($a \to 0$) and the big rip ($a \to \infty$), the gravitational coupling goes to infinity, $G \to \infty$. Choosing again

$$\Lambda \equiv \frac{\pi^2}{t_s^2} \;\text{ and }\; a_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Lambda}}, \tag{11}$$

the Friedmann equation reads

$$H^2 = \frac{1}{a^2}\left(1 + \Lambda a^2\right)^2 = \Lambda^2 a^2 + 2\Lambda + \frac{1}{a^2}, \tag{12}$$

where the first term on the right-hand side scales as phantom matter [45], which drives a big-rip singularity.

III. QUANTUM MULTIVERSES AND THE ENTANGLEMENT

A. Wheeler-deWitt (second) quantization

Let us now canonically quantize the models being classically depicted in Sect. II. Taking into account the classical value of the momentum conjugated to the scale factor,

$$p_a = -a\frac{da}{dt}, \tag{13}$$



FIG. 2: Scale factor for the cyclic multiverse (tangential pulse).



FIG. 3: Creation of cyclic universes in entangled pairs (sinusoidal pulse).

the Hamiltonian constraint, which can be written as

$$p_a^2 - \omega^2(a) = 0, \tag{14}$$

can easily be derived from the Friedmann equations (5) and (12), with

$$\omega^2_{\rm sin}(a) \equiv a^2 - \Lambda a^4. \tag{15}$$

for the sinusoidal pulse and

$$\omega^2_{\rm tan}(a) \equiv \Lambda^2 a^6 + 2\Lambda a^4 + a^2. \tag{16}$$

for the tangential pulse.

By canonically quantizing the classical momentum, $p_a \to -i\frac{\partial}{\partial a}$, and with an appropriate choice of factor ordering[1], we arrive at the Wheeler-DeWitt equation

$$\ddot{\phi} + \omega^2\phi = 0, \tag{17}$$

where, $\phi \equiv \phi(a)$, is the wave function of the universe and the dot indicates a derivative with respect to the scale factor, i.e. $\dot{\phi} \equiv \frac{d\phi}{da}$. In (17) $\omega^2(a)$ defined by (15) or (16) plays the role of the Wheeler-DeWitt potential which is the base for the studies of different scenarios due to the boundary conditions for the wave function [17, 38–40]. The WKB solutions of (17) are given by

$$\phi_\pm \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}} e^{\pm iS}, \tag{18}$$

where, $\dot{S} = \omega$. For the sinusoidal pulse, we then get

$$S = \int da\, \omega_{\rm sin}(a) = -\frac{\left(1-\Lambda a^2\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{3\Lambda}. \tag{19}$$

[1] A different choice of factor ordering would introduce a mass term in the equation of the generalized harmonic oscillator (17). It would not modify neither the procedure nor the qualitative meaning of the results.

Let us notice that for $a \in (0, a_0)$, with $a_0 \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Lambda}}$, the WKB wave function (18) would represent a Lorentzian (classical) universe, whereas for the value $a > a_0$, the wave function represents the exponential decay of the Euclidean regime or the quantum barrier, as it was expected.

The two signs in the exponent of (18) correspond to two different branches of the universe being considered. Let us notice that the eigenvalue of the momentum for the WKB solutions (18) is given, at first order, by

$$\hat{p}\phi_\pm \equiv -i\frac{\partial\phi_\pm}{\partial a} \approx \pm\dot{S}\phi_\pm = \pm\omega\phi_\pm, \tag{20}$$

and in the semiclassical limit it must be highly peaked around the classical value p_a, given by Eq. (13). Then, $a\frac{da}{dt} \approx \mp\omega(a)$, for the two signs given in Eq. (18), and thus

$$\frac{da}{dt} = \pm\sqrt{1-h^2a^2}, \tag{21}$$

where $h^2 \equiv \Lambda$, and Λ is given in Eq. (6). We thus obtain two classical branches, one with a scale factor given by

$$a(t) = \frac{1}{h}\sin[h(t-t_0)], \tag{22}$$

and the other with scale factor given by

$$a(t) = \frac{1}{h}\sin[h(t_0-t)]. \tag{23}$$

They are related by the time symmetry, $t \to -t$ ($t_0 \to -t_0$), so they appear to be the same universe for any internal observer, provided that the universes are created in entangled pairs (see Fig. 3) and that the time variables of the observers follow an antipodal-like symmetry [46, 47]. Before reaching the big crunch singularities, which are avoided by the effects of the varying gravitational constant (2) (see Ref. [31]), one branch of the universe can undergo a quantum transition to the the other branch universe, appearing there as a newborn universe, forming thus a continuous and cyclic multiverse.

For the tangential pulse, we arrive at

$$S = \int da\, \omega_{\rm tan}(a) = \frac{1}{4}\, a^2\left(2+\Lambda a^2\right). \tag{24}$$



FIG. 4: Creation of cyclic universes in entangled pairs (tangential pulse).

Following a similar reasoning to that made for the sinusoidal pulse, the evolution of the two branches that correspond to the plus and minus signs of $\phi_\pm$ in Eq. (18) is given now by

$$\frac{da}{dt} = \pm\left(h^2a^2 + 1\right), \tag{25}$$

with, $h^2 \equiv \Lambda$, where Λ is given by Eq. (11). We thus obtain

$$a(t) = \frac{1}{h}\tan[h(t - t_0)], \tag{26}$$

and

$$a(t) = \frac{1}{h}\tan[h(t_0 - t)], \tag{27}$$

for the two branches of the tangential pulse. They are depicted in Fig. 4.

We can now describe the creation of cyclic universes in entangled pairs. The universes are not singular at the value $a = 0$ because the varying constants make finite the value of the mass density and pressure at the turning points [31]. However, it is expected that quantum effects would become dominant as we approach the value $a = 0$. Furthermore, if quantum fluctuations of the wave function of the universe are considered [47], then, a minimum value $a_{\rm min}$ appears, below of which no real solution can be found. In this classically forbidden region, double Euclidean instantons can be created giving rise, in the Lorentzian regime, to an entangled pair of universes whose quantum states are quantum-mechanically correlated (see, Figs. 3–4). The antipodal symmetry [46, 47] makes an observer living in the universe with time variable t_1 to consider her branch as the expanding branch and the preceding one as the contracting branch. However, for the observer of the universe with time variable t_2 they are the other way around, actually. Both observers are thus initially living in an expanding universe and the two branches can be combined to form a universe that is classically indistinguishable from the picture depicted in Figs. 1 and 2, respectively.

B. Third quantization

The creation of universes in entangled pairs can properly be described in the framework of the third quantization, which parallels the formalism of a quantum field theory of the wave function of the universe propagating along the (mini-)superspace. In that framework, creation and annihilation operators can formally be defined much in a similar way to how is done in a usual quantum field theory. Let us first notice that (17) can be considered as the wave equation of a scalar field (the wave function of the universe, ϕ) that can be obtained from the Hamilton equations of the following (third-quantized) Hamiltonian [18, 21, 22]

$$\mathrm{H} = \frac{1}{2}P_\phi^2 + \frac{\omega^2(a)}{2}\phi^2, \tag{28}$$

where, $P_\phi \equiv \dot{\phi}$, and ω is given by (15) or (16), for the sinusoidal and the tangential pulse, respectively. In the third quantization formalism the wave function of the universe, ϕ, and the conjugate momentum, P_ϕ, are promoted to be operators in a similar way as it is done in a quantum field theory. The wave function operator can be written, in the Heisenberg picture, as

$$\hat{\phi}(a) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}e^{iS(a)}\hat{b}_+ + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}e^{-iS(a)}\hat{b}_-^\dagger, \tag{29}$$

where, $\hat{b}_+ \equiv \hat{b}_+(a_{\rm min})$ and $\hat{b}_-^\dagger \equiv \hat{b}_-^\dagger(a_{\rm min})$, are constant operators given at some initial value, $a = a_{\rm min}$, at which the universes are created. For the sinusoidal pulse, $\hat{b}_-$ and $\hat{b}_-^\dagger$ would represent the annihilation and creation operators, respectively, of the branches of the universe given by (22), and $\hat{b}_+$ and $\hat{b}_+^\dagger$ are the annihilation and creation operators, respectively, of the branches of the universe given by (23), both evaluated at the constant value, $a = a_{\rm min}$. Analogously for the tangential pulse, $\hat{b}_-$ and $\hat{b}_-^\dagger$ would represent the annihilation and creation operators, respectively, of the branches of the universe given by (26), and $\hat{b}_+$ and $\hat{b}_+^\dagger$ are the annihilation and creation operators, respectively, of the branches of the universe given by (27), both evaluated at the constant value, $a = a_{\rm min}$. The branches are created in entangled pairs because of the quantum symmetry of the Wheeler-DeWitt equation (17) with respect to the value $\pm\omega$ of the classical branches, quantum-mechanically represented by $\phi_\pm$. This is formally similar to the creation of particles in entangled pairs with opposite directions in a quantum field theory because the symmetry of the wave equation with respect to the values $\pm k$ of the momentum of the particles.

The vacuum state of the $(b_\pm, b_\pm^\dagger)$ representation is given by the state, $|0_+, 0_-\rangle$. However, it is not a stable vacuum because of the scale-factor dependence of the frequency $\omega(a)$. Similarly to what is done in a quantum field theory of a scalar field that propagates in a curved spacetime, where it is imposed that the vacuum state should be stable (i.e. with no particle creation) along a geodesic, we can impose here the boundary condition for the proper representation for the vacuum state of the minisuperspace that it has to be stable under the evolution of the universe along a geodesic of the minisuperspace. The minisuperspace that we are considering here is the most simplified one and it is just formed by the scale factor as the configuration variable. However, in more detailed cosmological models, the minisuperspace is formed by the scale factor and the scalar field, φ, that represents the energy-matter content of the universe. Then, a geodesic of the minisuperspace is precisely the path given by the classical relation, $\varphi = \varphi(a)$. The boundary condition that the cosmological vacuum is stable along the geodesic of the minisuperspace means that it is stable under the classical evolution of the universes, i.e., once the multiverse is in the state[2] $|N\rangle$ of the invariant representation for some value $a_0 > a_{\min}$, then, it will remain in that state at any other value of the scale factor $a(t)$ along the evolution of any universe.

The proper representation for the vacuum state of the multiverse is then given by an invariant representation. For the generalized harmonic oscillator (17), it can be given by[3] [21, 22, 49]

$$c_+ = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{1}{R}\phi + i(RP_\phi - \dot{R}\phi)\right), \tag{30}$$

$$c_-^\dagger = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{1}{R}\phi - i(RP_\phi - \dot{R}\phi)\right), \tag{31}$$

where $R = \sqrt{\phi_1^2 + \phi_2^2}$, with ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 being two real solutions of (17) satisfying[4]

$$\phi_1\dot{\phi}_2 - \dot{\phi}_1\phi_2 = 1. \tag{32}$$

However, in terms of the invariant representation (30)–(31), the Hamiltonian (28) reads

$$H = H_0^- + H_0^+ + H_I, \tag{33}$$

where

$$H_0^\pm = \Omega(a)\left(c_\pm^\dagger c_\pm + \frac{1}{2}\right), \tag{34}$$

and,

$$H_I = \gamma(a)c_+^\dagger c_-^\dagger + \gamma^* c_+ c_-, \tag{35}$$

with

$$\Omega(a) = \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{1}{R^2} + R^2\omega^2 + \dot{R}^2\right), \tag{36}$$

$$\gamma(a) = -\frac{1}{4}\left\{\left(\dot{R} + \frac{i}{R}\right)^2 + \omega^2 R^2\right\}. \tag{37}$$

The Hamiltonian (33) can be interpreted as the Hamiltonian of two interacting universes with a Hamiltonian of interaction given by H_I. The picture is then the following. A hypothetical external observer moving along a geodesic of the minisuperspace would perceive it in the vacuum state. The only universes that would be created, from this point of view, would be virtual universes created in entangled pairs due to the symmetry of the quantum components of classical solutions given by, $p_a = \pm\omega$. The entanglement between the universes of each entangled pair can be seen as a non-local interaction given by H_I that goes to zero as the entanglement disappears. In that limit, the invariant representation becomes the diagonal representation of the Hamiltonian (28),

$$b_+(a) = \sqrt{\frac{\omega}{2}}\left(\phi + \frac{i}{\omega}P_\phi\right), \tag{38}$$

$$b_-^\dagger(a) = \sqrt{\frac{\omega}{2}}\left(\phi - \frac{i}{\omega}P_\phi\right), \tag{39}$$

with $\omega \equiv \omega(a)$ given by (15) or (16) for the sinusoidal and the tangential pulse, respectively. For the value $a = a_{\min}$, it is the Schrödinger picture of the representation (29). However, the representation (38)–(39) can represent the state of the universe for any other value of the scale factor. For instance, it may represent the quantum state of an evolved universe like ours, with $a \gg a_{\min}$, with inhabitants living on a planet there. For such an observer, i.e. for an internal observer, $b(a)$ and $b^\dagger(a)$ would not describe annihilation and creation of universes because these observers can only perceive their own universe. Instead, they would represent the annihilation and creation of quantum modes of the general quantum state of their single universes.

IV. THERMODYNAMICS OF ENTANGLEMENT

A. General framework

The scenario is then the following: the multiverse is in the vacuum state, which is quantum-mechanically described by the ground state of the invariant representation of the minisuperspace, $|0_+0_-\rangle_c$. Given that the

[2] Or more exactly in a superposition state $\sum c_N|N\rangle$.

[3] This invariant representation is not unique, see for instance Ref. [48]. Moreover, the operators c and $c^\dagger$ are given in the Schrödinger representation, i.e., $\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}(b_+ + b_-^\dagger)$ and $P_\phi = i\sqrt{\frac{\omega}{2}}(b_-^\dagger - b_+)$.

[4] More generally, R can be given by $R = \sqrt{A\phi_1^2 + B\phi_2^2 + 2C\phi_1\phi_2}$, where $AB - C^2 = W^{-2}$, being W the wronskian of the two particular solutions ϕ_1 and ϕ_2, i.e. $W = \phi_1\dot{\phi}_2 - \dot{\phi}_1\phi_2$ (see Ref. [50]).

ground state $|0_+0_-\rangle_c$ is a pure state, its entropy is zero, and because it follows a unitary evolution in the minisuperspace, the entropy is constantly zero. From this point of view, therefore, there would be no arrow of time in the multiverse as it corresponds to a steady system. However, it is reasonable to think that the real evolution and the appearance of a physical arrow of time would only make sense in the context of a single universe for an internal observer. Such an arrow of time could be given by the entropy of entanglement of each single universe, which not only is not zero but it evolves with respect to the value of the scale factor, and provides a relationship between the physical and the mathematical arrows of time in each individual universe, as it corresponds to the point of view of an internal observer who does not see the rest of the multiverse.

Let us therefore consider the ground state of the invariant representation, $|0_+0_-\rangle_c$. In terms of the diagonal representation, $(\hat{b}_+, \hat{b}_-)$, which would represent the state of the universe for an internal observer, it is given by[5]

$$|0_+0_-\rangle_c = \frac{1}{|\alpha|}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{|\beta|}{|\alpha|}\right)^n |n_-, n_+\rangle_b, \tag{40}$$

where $|n_-, n_+\rangle_b$ are the entangled mode states of the diagonal representation given by (38)–(39), and α and β are the Bogoliubov coefficients that relate both representations, i.e.

$$\hat{c}_- = \alpha\hat{b}_- - \beta\hat{b}_+^\dagger, \tag{41}$$
$$\hat{c}_-^\dagger = \alpha^*\hat{b}_-^\dagger - \beta^*\hat{b}_+, \tag{42}$$

with, $|\alpha|^2 - |\beta|^2 = 1$. The plus and minus signs correspond to the two branches of the universe. We can now obtain the quantum state of a single universe of the entangled pair in the $(\hat{b}_+, \hat{b}_-)$ representation by tracing out the degrees of freedom of the partner universe. In the formalism of the density matrix

$$\rho_- = \mathrm{Tr}_+\rho \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} {}_b\langle n_+|\rho|n_+\rangle_b, \tag{43}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &= |0_+0_-\rangle_c\langle 0_+0_-| \\ &= \frac{1}{|\alpha|^2}\sum_{n,m}\left(\frac{|\beta|}{|\alpha|}\right)^{n+m}|n_-, n_+\rangle_b\langle m_-, m_+|,\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where (40) has been used. The result of the trace operation in (43) is typically a thermal state, given by [22]

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_- &= \frac{1}{|\alpha|^2}\sum_{n,m,l}\left(\frac{|\beta|}{|\alpha|}\right)^{n+m}\langle l_+|m_+\rangle|n_-\rangle_b\langle n_-|\langle m_+|l_+\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{|\alpha|^2}\sum_{n}\left(\frac{|\beta|}{|\alpha|}\right)^{2n}|n_-\rangle_b\langle n_-| \\ &= \frac{1}{|\alpha||\beta|}\sum_{n}\left(\frac{|\beta|}{|\alpha|}\right)^{2n+1}|n_-\rangle_b\langle n_-| \\ &= \frac{1}{Z}\sum_{n} e^{-\frac{\omega}{T}(n+\frac{1}{2})}|n_-\rangle_b\langle n_-|,\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

where, $Z^{-1} = 2\sinh\frac{\omega}{2T}$, with

$$T \equiv T(a) = \frac{\omega(a)}{2\ln\coth r}, \tag{46}$$

where

$$\tanh r \equiv \frac{|\beta|}{|\alpha|}, \tag{47}$$

with r playing the role of the entanglement parameter [9, 12]. Moreover, in order to obtain (45), we have used

$$\begin{aligned}Z^{-1} &= 2\sinh\frac{\omega}{2T} = 2\sinh\ln\coth r \\ &= \coth r - \tanh r = \frac{1}{\sinh r\cosh r}.\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

In fact, we have derived the corresponding thermal state that represents the state of a single universe of the entangled pair for an internal observer from the zero entropy vacuum state of the superspace of an external observer. The quantum entropy or *entropy of entanglement* of the universe can now be easily obtained from (45) [8–10, 12–14]. It is given by the von Neumann entropy

$$S(\rho) = -\mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho\ln\rho\right), \tag{49}$$

applied to the thermal state ρ_-, and yields [22]

$$S_{\mathrm{ent}}(a) = \cosh^2 r\,\ln\cosh^2 r - \sinh^2 r\,\ln\sinh^2 r. \tag{50}$$

The dependence of the entropy of entanglement on the scale factor means that the evolution of each single universe is no longer unitary due to the non-local interaction that produces the entanglement. The evolution of an entangled pair, however, is unitary and so there is no information paradox for an external observer.

It is also worth noticing that the same value of entropy would be obtained for the partner universe, i.e. $S_{\mathrm{ent}}(\rho_+) = S_{\mathrm{ent}}(\rho_-)$, satisfying the subadditivity of entropy theorem [51]

$$S(\rho) \leq S(\rho_-) + S(\rho_+) = 2S(\rho_\pm), \tag{51}$$

where the inequality is saturated whenever ρ_+ and ρ_- correspond to two uncorrelated (classical) universes with

$$\frac{dS_+}{da} = \frac{dS_-}{da}, \tag{52}$$

[5] The formalism parallels that given in Ref. [22].

and $S_\pm \equiv S(\rho_\pm)$. A change of the entropies with respect to the internal time variables is

$$\frac{dS_+}{dt_1} = \frac{dS_-}{dt_2} \Rightarrow \frac{dS_+}{dt_{1,2}} = -\frac{dS_-}{dt_{1,2}}, \tag{53}$$

provided that the time variables t_1 and t_2 of the branches are related by the antipodal symmetry commented earlier after Eq. (23).

Other parameters of quantum thermodynamics can be defined as well [22] (see also, Refs. [52, 53]). The mean value of the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_- = \omega\left(\hat{b}_-^\dagger \hat{b}_- + \frac{1}{2}\right), \tag{54}$$

turns out to be

$$E_-(a) \equiv \langle \hat{H}_- \rangle = \mathrm{Tr}\hat{\rho}_- \hat{H}_- = \omega\left(\langle \hat{N}(a)\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\right), \tag{55}$$

with

$$\langle \hat{N}(a)\rangle = \sinh^2 r. \tag{56}$$

Changes in the quantum informational analogues of heat and work are [22]

$$\delta W_- = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{\rho}_- \frac{d\hat{H}_-}{da}\right) = \frac{\partial\omega}{\partial a}\left(\langle \hat{N}(a)\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\right), \tag{57}$$

$$\delta Q_- = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\frac{d\hat{\rho}_-}{da}\hat{H}_-\right) = \omega\frac{\partial\langle \hat{N}(a)\rangle}{\partial a}. \tag{58}$$

It can easily be checked that the first law of thermodynamics is satisfied, i.e. $dE_- = \delta W_- + \delta Q_-$. It can also be checked that the production of entropy is zero,

$$\sigma = \frac{dS_{\mathrm{ent}}}{da} - \frac{1}{T}\frac{\delta Q}{da} = 0, \tag{59}$$

with T being defined in Eq. (46). It thus corresponds to a reversible process. This was expected because no dissipative process has been taken into account. It means that the entanglement alone does not provide us with an arrow of time because the evolution leading to an increasing value of the scale factor or that leading to a decreasing value are both allowed. However, if local dissipative processes are taken into account, then, the production of entropy must necessarily be positive, i.e. $\sigma \geq 0$, making the evolution of the universe irreversible. Let us notice that by local processes in the context of the multiverse we mean any process that may happen inside a single universe like, for instance, the creation of cosmic structures or even customary *non-local* processes in the context of the spacetime non-locality of quantum mechanics, i.e. any process that is not correlated with any other process of the partner universe.

B. The sinusoidal pulse – entanglement quantities

We can now compute the entropy of entanglement for the cyclic multiverse considered in Sections II and III. Firstly, one derives ϕ and P_ϕ from (38) and (39), then inserts them into (30) and (31), in order to get that the values of α and β in (41) and (42) are given by

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{R\sqrt{\omega}} + R\sqrt{\omega} - \frac{i\dot{R}}{\sqrt{\omega}}\right), \tag{60}$$

$$\beta = -\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{R\sqrt{\omega}} - R\sqrt{\omega} - \frac{i\dot{R}}{\sqrt{\omega}}\right), \tag{61}$$

with $R = \sqrt{\phi_1^2 + \phi_2^2}$, being ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 two real solutions of the Wheeler-DeWitt equation (17). Considering linear combinations of the WKB solutions (18), a natural choice for ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 is

$$\phi_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\omega}}\cos S, \tag{62}$$

$$\phi_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\omega}}\sin S, \tag{63}$$

which yields $R\sqrt{\omega} = 1$, and

$$\alpha = 1 + \frac{i\dot{\omega}}{4\omega^2}, \tag{64}$$

$$\beta = -\frac{i\dot{\omega}}{4\omega^2}, \tag{65}$$

with $|\alpha|^2 - |\beta|^2 = 1$, and where $\dot{R} = -\frac{1}{2}\dot{\omega}\omega^{-\frac{3}{2}}$ has been used. Then,

$$\tanh r = \frac{|\beta|}{|\alpha|} = \frac{\dot{\omega}}{\sqrt{16\omega^4 + \dot{\omega}^2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{4\omega^2}{\dot{\omega}}\right)^2}}, \tag{66}$$

with, $\dot{\omega} \equiv \frac{d\omega}{da}$, and $\omega(a)$ given by (15), so that

$$\tanh r = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + 16a^4\frac{(1-\Lambda a^2)^3}{(1-2\Lambda a^2)^2}}} \equiv q. \tag{67}$$

Note that $q = 1$ at zeros of the Wheeler-DeWitt potential (15) present at $a = 0$ and $a_{\max} = 1/\sqrt{\Lambda}$, while $q = 0$ at its maximum for $a_{\mathrm{c}} = \sqrt{2\Lambda}$ [40]. The temperature of entanglement (46) and the entropy of entanglement (50) are both measures of the rate of entanglement between the universes and can be rewritten using (67) as

$$T = -\frac{a\sqrt{1-\Lambda a^2}}{2\ln q}, \tag{68}$$

$$S = \frac{1}{1-q^2}\ln\left[\frac{1}{1-q^2}\right] - \frac{q^2}{1-q^2}\ln\left[\frac{q^2}{1-q^2}\right]. \tag{69}$$

The entropy is plotted in Fig. 5 in terms of the value of the scale factor a, and using Eqs. (22) and (23), it is depicted in Fig. 6 in terms of the cosmic time t. It can be



FIG. 5: The entropy of entanglement for the sinusoidal pulse plotted in terms of the scale factor, where $a = 1$ corresponds to $a_{\rm max}$.



FIG. 6: The entropy of entanglement for the sinusoidal pulse plotted in terms of the cosmic time, where $t = \pi/2$ corresponds to the point of maximum expansion and $t = \pi$ to the point of the big crunch.

checked that the entanglement is maximum – in fact, it goes to infinity – for both the smallest value of the scale factor and also for the maximum value of the scale factor – the turning point of expansion at $a_{\rm max} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Lambda}}$.

Entanglement is usually associated to non-locality. However, there is no need for a common spacetime between the universes of the multiverse. Therefore, the question about locality or non-locality has to be extended in the quantum multiverse to the independence or the interdependence, respectively, of the quantum states of the universes. On the other hand, entanglement is also interpreted as a sharp quantum effect having no classical counterpart. This is so in the sense that the probability distribution of the number of particles in an entangled state may violate certain classical inequalities [54]. However, we have presented here an example of quantum entanglement between otherwise classical universes (let us recall that the momentum (20) is highly peaked around the classical value (13), giving rise to the (semi)-classical branches (22)–(23) and (26)–(27) for the sinusoidal and the tangential pulses, respectively). Therefore, the condition between classicality and entanglement must be revised as well in the context of the quantum multiverse.



FIG. 7: Creation of entangled branches of cyclic universes. At the big bang as well as at the maximum expansion the branches they become maximally entangled.

In the case of the sinusoidal pulse, the universes originate as an entangled pair. Their quantum states become more and more separable as they evolve towards the value $a_{\rm c}$ of the scale factor, where the separability of their quantum states is maximum (their entropy of entanglement is minimum). Afterwards, the entanglement between their states starts growing again to reach a maximum value at the turning point, $a_{\rm max}$, where the universes become maximally entangled again. One could then state that at the points of maximum entanglement the quantum effects in the multiverses are expected to be dominant. This is the case, but not because of the maximum amount of entanglement between the universes (we shall see a counterexample in the tangential pulse). The quantum effects become dominant because the proximity of the points $a = 0$ and $a = a_{\rm max}$ of the configuration space to the classically forbidden region of $a < 0$ and $a > a_{\rm max}$, respectively. This is something which fully confirms earlier studies of Refs. [35, 36, 42–44].

C. The tangential pulse – entanglement quantities

The same development of the sinusoidal pulse can be made now for the tangential pulse by using the frequency (16) instead of (15). In that case, the parameter q turns out to be

$$q \equiv \tanh r = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{16(\Lambda a^3 + a)^4}{(3\Lambda a^2 + 1)^2}}}. \qquad (70)$$



FIG. 8: The entropy of entanglement for the tangential pulse plotted in terms of the scale factor.



FIG. 9: The entropy of entanglement for the tangential pulse plotted in terms of the cosmic time, where $t = \pi/2$ corresponds to the point of the big rip.

Then, the temperature (68) now reads

$$T = -\frac{a(\Lambda a^2 + 1)}{2 \ln q}, \tag{71}$$

and the entropy of entanglement is given by Eq. (69) with the value of q given by (70). The respective plots for S are depicted in Figs. 8 and 9.

It can easily be seen that the entropy of entanglement is maximum – in fact, again infinite – at the big bang, but then monotonically decreases and reaches zero at the big rip singularity. This is an example that shows that the amount of entanglement is not correlated, at least in the case of the quantum multiverse, with the classicality of the universes because quantum effects become dominant as the universe approach the big rip singularity [37]. However, we have shown that the amount of entanglement decreases towards zero as the universes approach the big rip. Their quantum representations become more and more separable and the non-local interaction given by H_I in (33) goes to zero. They can be considered then as individual, non-interacting universes. However, this has nothing to do with the quantum effects of the matter fields that propagate therein. In fact, as it happens in the sinusoidal pulse, these may become dominant because the proximity of the scale factor to a classical forbidden region, which in the case of the tangential pulse is given by $a \to \infty$ at the value, $t = t_0 + \frac{(2n+1)\pi}{2h}$ (see Fig. 4).



FIG. 10: Scale factor (blue, dotted), parameter q (green, dashed), entropy of entanglement (yellow, solid line), and temperature of entanglement (red, dot-dashed) for the sinusoidal pulse. Unlike the entropy of entanglement, the parameter q turns out to be a non-divergent measure of the entanglement.



FIG. 11: Scale factor (blue, dotted), parameter q (green, dashed), entropy of entanglement (yellow, solid line), and temperature of entanglement (red, dot-dashed) for the tangential pulse. The temperature of entanglement might be an indicator of the quantumness of the universes.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have studied the possible creation and evolution of parallel cyclic universes evolving within the multiverse which may allow different physical constants and the same geometry. These universes are classically disconnected, but quantum-mechanically entangled and so one is able to apply the thermodynamics of entanglement theory which is known from many physical contexts. We have shown that the entropy of entanglement is large at the big bang and big crunch singularities of the parallel universes as well as at the maxima of the expansion of individual universes. The latter confirms some earlier studies that quantum effects are strong at the turning points of the evolution of the universes (i.e. for macroscopic universes) – the result was obtained on the base of the formalism of the timeless Wheeler-DeWitt equation and decoherence. Such effects (though related to the same universe) were studied already in quantum cosmology [42–44]. In our scenario it requires at least two parallel universes (the "doubleverse" of Ref. [31]), for which one can have one universe being replaced quantum-mechanically due to a tunnelling effect into the second universe at their maximum expansion points.

Our studies have also shown that the entropy of entanglement at the big rip singularities goes to zero despite the fact that we deal with apparently Planck density macroscopic universes (which violate the null energy condition) and they should, according to the above statement, be of a quantum nature. However, the vanishing of the entanglement seems to be the property of a big rip singularity which leads to a total dissociation of the universe/multiverse structures into infinitely separated patches which loose any sign of entanglement.

The multiverse that we have studied is quantum-mechanically entangled and there are periods of its evolution where the entanglement matters (here the classical singularities such as the big bang and the big rip as well as maximum expansion points) and can lead to an effect of an exchange of the universes by quantum-mechanical tunneling. However, the relation between classicality and entanglement still should be sorted out in the context of the quantum multiverse.

In quantum optics, the sharp quantum character of the entangled states comes from the fact that the photon distribution that corresponds to a two-mode entangled state of the electromagnetic field does not satisfy certain classical inequalities [54]. This violation clearly reveals that the description of the electromagnetic field in terms of photons as individual and independent entities is not appropriate in the regimes where this violation occurs unless we consider as well non-local interactions among them, irrespective of the distance they are separated, which is a highly non-classical assumption.

On cosmological grounds, it means that the quantum character of the inter-universal entanglement is directly related to the independence of the state of the universes and the presence or the absence of non-local interactions in the minisuperspace. It implies that if we consider the multiverse as the most general scenario in cosmology, which is favored by fundamental theories like the string theories, then, we are forced to consider as well interactions among the universes of the multiverse. In that case, the properties and the evolution of the universe, mainly during the very early phase of its evolution but, as we have shown, as well during other stages like the turning point in the case of cyclic universes, would depend not only on the internal properties of the universe but also on the global properties of the whole multiversal state.

A different question is the quantum nature of the universe in terms of the fluctuations of the matter fields. Let us first notice that the entangled universes considered in the paper are quantum-mechanically represented by WKB wave functions that are valid for values of the scale factor for which, $S(a) \gg \hbar$. In that case, the fluctuations of the spacetime are largely suppressed, the eigenvalue of the quantum momentum is highly picked around the classical value and, thus, a time variable can be chosen so that the scale factor satisfies the momentum constraint, which is the Friedmann equation. In that sense, the evolution of the spacetime is classical.

However, we know that quantum fluctuations become dominant not only at the big bang and big crunch singularities but also at the turning point of a cyclic universe [35] as well as at the big rip singularity [37]. Then, if the degree of entanglement between the states of the universes is related to the quantumness of their matter fields, then, the entropy of entanglement, which is the standard measure of entanglement, might not be the most reliable measure of quantumness because, at least in the case of the big rip singularity, it goes to zero despite the quantum behaviour of the matter field that propagate therein [37]. It seems that a more reliable indicator of the quantum character of the universes could be the temperature of entanglement, which grows to infinity whenever the state of the universe approaches a classically forbidden region, at least in the cases considered in this paper: big bang, big crunch, turning point, and big rip, ($a \to 0$ in the first two cases, $a \to \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Lambda}}$ in the turning point of the sinusoidal pulse, and $t \to \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{\Lambda}}$ in the tangential pulse, see Figs. 10-11).

On the other hand, the results obtained in this paper clearly show that entanglement is directly related to the separability of the quantum states of a given representation. In our case, this is represented by the quantum independence of the opposite modes of the diagonal representation, i.e. the modes that represent opposite branches from the point of view of internal observers, provided that the multiverse stays in the ground state of an invariant representation, regardless of the semiclassical character of the branches. The representations considered here are the physically relevant in the cosmological problem we are dealing with. However, it is worth noticing that the consideration of different representations, which would ultimately be induced by the consideration of different boundary conditions, could have thrown different rates of

entanglement. Thus, entanglement is directly connected with a representation problem, i.e. what representation has to be chosen to represent the physical system under consideration, and once this is fixed, it is also related to the correlated properties of two classically disconnected (separated) subsystems.

Finally, a separate problem is what one means by the notion of the universe within the framework of the multiverse using, for example, the hierarchy given in Ref. [2]. If we use the antipodal symmetry for the time variables of the consecutive branches like it is depicted in Fig. 7, then, all branches are quantum-mechanically exact copies of each other except for the internal processes given in the particular branches, which should be randomly distributed along the finite number of possibilities. Thus, the multiverse depicted in this paper could be interpreted as a Level III multiverse because in an infinite number of universes all probable distributions of the internal degrees of freedom would be accounted for (in fact, an infinite number of times). However, as it is pointed out in Ref. [55], this Level III multiverse would represent nothing more than a Level I multiverse, i.e. an infinite number of Hubble volumes, if the fundamental constants are taken to be the same in all universes, or a Level II multiverse if instead, different values and functions are taken for the fundamental (varying and not varying) constants.

Acknowledgments

The work of M. P. D., A. B. and M.K. was supported by the Polish National Science Center (NCN) under grant No. DEC-2012/06/A/ST2/00395. The work of S. R.-P. was supported partially by the project FIS2012-38816 from the Spanish Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad.

[1] H. Everett, Rev. Mod. Phys. **29**, 454 (1957).
[2] M. Tegmark, Sci. Am. **288**, 40 (2003).
[3] J. B. Hartle, Living in a superposition, arXiv:1511.01550.
[4] L. Susskind, The anthropic landscape of string theory, arXiv:hep-th/0302219.
[5] T. Banks, The top 10^{500} reasons not to believe in the string landscape, arXiv:1208.5715.
[6] L. Mersini-Houghton and R. Holman, J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. 02 (2009) 006.
[7] W. H. Kinney, J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. 11 (2016) 013.
[8] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
[9] K. Nakagawa, Entanglement entropies of coupled harmonic oscillators, arXiv:1601.03584.
[10] P. Chaturverdi, V. Malvimat, G. Sengupta, Covariant holographic entanglement negativity, arXiv:1611.00593.
[11] J.-W. Lee, Quantum entanglement of dark matter, arXiv:1510.07968.
[12] S. Başkal, Y. S. Kim, M. E. Noz, Symmetry **8**, 55 (2016).
[13] S. Banerjee, Y. Nakaguchi, and T. Nishioka, J. High Energy Phys. 03 (2016) 048.
[14] H. Casini, D. A. Galante, and R. C. Myers, J. High Energy Phys. 03 (2016) 194.
[15] D. Goyeneche, D. Alsina, J. I. Latorre, A. Riera, K. Życzkowski, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 032316 (2015).
[16] B. C. Hiesmayr, M. J. A. de Dood, and W. Löffler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 073601 (2016).
[17] C. Kiefer, *Quantum Gravity*, International Series of Monographs on Physics **155**, third edition (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2012).
[18] A. Strominger, Baby universes, in: Quantum cosmology and baby universes, Proc. of the 7th Jerusalem Winter School for Theoretical Physics, ed. by S. Coleman et al. (World Scientific, 1991).
[19] L. O. Pimentel and C. Mora, Phys. Lett. A **280**, 191 (2001).
[20] C. Kiefer and E. A. Martinez, Class. Quantum Grav. **10**, 2511 (1993).
[21] S. Robles-Pérez and P. F. Gonzalez-Diaz, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 083529 (2010).
[22] S. Robles-Pérez and P. F. González-Díaz, J. Exp. Theor. Phys. **118**, 34 (2014).
[23] S. Robles-Pérez, A. Alonso-Serrano, C. Bastos, and O. Bertolami, Phys. Lett. B **759**, 328 (2016).
[24] S. Coleman and F. De Luccia, Phys. Rev. D **21**, 3305 (1980).
[25] B. J. Carr and S. W. Hawking, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **168**, 399 (1974).
[26] M. Kopp, S. Hofmann, and J. Weller, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 124025 (2011).
[27] B. J. Carr and T. Harada, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 084048 (2014).
[28] L. Dai, E. Pajer, and F. Schmidt, J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. 10 (2015) 059.
[29] J. Quintin and R. H. Brandenberger, J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. 11 (2016) 029.
[30] N. Oshita and J. Yokoyama, Creation of an inflationary universe out of a black hole, arXiv:1601.03929.
[31] K. Marosek, M. P. Dąbrowski, and A. Balcerzak, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **461**, 2777 (2016).
[32] R. A. Tolman, *Relativity, thermodynamics, and cosmology*, (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1934).
[33] J. D. Barrow and M. P. Dąbrowski, Mon. Notices R. Astron. Soc. **275**, 850 (1995).
[34] M. P. Dąbrowski and K. Marosek, J. Cosmol. Astroparticle Phys. 02 (2013) 012.
[35] C. Kiefer, Phys. Rev. D **38**, 1761 (1988).
[36] C. Kiefer, C. and Zeh, H. D., Phys. Rev. D **51**, 4145 (1995).
[37] M. P. Dąbrowski , C. Kiefer, and B. Sandhöfer, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 044022 (2006).
[38] A. Vilenkin, Phys. Lett. B **117**, 25 (1982); Phys. Rev. D **27**, 2848 (1983); *ibidem* **30**, 509 (1984).
[39] J. M. Hartle and S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D **28**, 2960 (1983).
[40] D. Atkatz, Am. J. Phys. **62**, 619 (1994).
[41] M. P. Dąbrowski, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **248**, 199 (1996).
[42] M. P. Dąbrowski and A. L. Larsen, Phys. Rev. D **52**,

3424 (1995).
[43] A. T. Mithani and A. Vilenkin, J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. 01 (2012) 028.
[44] A. T. Mithani and A. Vilenkin, J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. 05 (2014) 006.
[45] R. R. Caldwell, Phys. Lett. B **545**, 23 (2002); R. R. Caldwell, M. Kamionkowski, and N. N. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 071301 (2003); M.P. Dąbrowski, T. Stachowiak and M. Szydłowski, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 103519 (2003).
[46] A. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **200**, 272 (1988).
[47] S. J. Robles-Pérez, Journal of Gravity, **2014**, 382675 (2014).
[48] S. P. Kim and D. N. Page, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 012104 (2011).
[49] H. R. Lewis and W. B. Riesenfeld, J. Math. Phys. **10**, 1458 (1969).
[50] P. G. L. Leach, J. Phys. A **16**, 3261 (1983).
[51] H. Araki and E. H. Lieb, Commun. Math. Phys. **18**, 160 (1970).
[52] R. Alicki et al., Open Syst. Inf. Dyn. **11**, 205 (2004).
[53] J. Gemmer et al., *Quantum thermodynamics* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 2009).
[54] M. D. Reid and D. F. Walls, Phys. Rev. A **34**, 1260 (1986).
[55] M. Tegmark, Parallel universes, in: *Science and ultimate reality*, ed. by J. D. Barrow, P. C. W. Davies and C. L. Harper (Cambridge University Press, 2004).